

REMARKS

The applicants have carefully reviewed the application in light of the Office Action dated September 17, 2008 and the Advisory Action dated December 1, 2008. Applicants amend claims 1 3, 4, 8, 10, 13-20, 22, 25 and 27. The amendments to the claims have only been done to expedite the prosecution.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 10-20, and 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,745,238 B1 to Giljum et al. (“*Giljum*”). In addition, Claims 14-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Giljum* and U.S. Patent No. 7,234,110 B2 to Sumitomo (“*Sumitomo*”). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the cited art. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over *Giljum*.

Claim 1 recites “automatically generating a Web page based, at least in part, on the received selection of the plurality of the different selectable components and the received parameter values, wherein the Web page presents the plurality of the different selectable components in accordance with the received parameter values.” In contrast, *Giljum* merely teaches a screen for adding items, such as files, to a user’s folder (*Giljum*, column 13, lines 1-3, 52-54, column 14, lines 22-27). In particular, *Giljum* teaches that a Web Site Database includes item display options that allow a user to select where the item will be located on a rendered web page (*Giljum*, column 13, lines 56-59). *Giljum* also teaches that the web page includes areas for “regular items” and that the regular items are displayed under a category banner grouped by category. Allowing a user to add items, such as regular items, to a regular item section of a web page is not the same as generating a Web page based on selected components from a plurality of different selectable components and their received values. Accordingly, for at least the reasons previously mentioned, independent claim 1 and claim 14 and their corresponding dependent claims are further allowable over the cited art.

Applicant : Jos Jaspers, et al.
Serial No. : 10/749,421
Filed : December 31, 2003
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 14012-0051001 / 50-03-009

CONCLUSION

Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all Claims.

If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicants hereby request a telephone conference with the Examiner and further request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

No fees are believed to be due. However, please apply any deficiencies or any other required fees or any credits to deposit account **05-0765 OF ELECTRONIC DATA SYSTEMS CORP.**, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 17, 2008

/Michael E. Cox/

Michael E. Cox
Reg. No. 47,505

Customer No.: **26230**
Fish & Richardson P.C.

Direct Phone: (214) 760-6107
Fax: (214) 747-2091